

New York Tribune

First to Last—the Truth: News—Editorials—Advertisements
Member of the Audit Bureau of Circulations

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 23, 1920.

Owned and published daily by New York Tribune Inc., 50 West 44th Street, New York City.
Editor: G. V. Rogers. Vice-President: Helen Rogers. Secretary: H. S. Madell. Treasurer: A. J. Davis. Tribune Building, 134 Nassau Street, New York City. Telephone: 3000.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: By mail, including postage in the United States.
One Year, \$10.00
Six Months, \$6.00
Three Months, \$3.50
By Mail, Foreign: One Year, \$12.00
Six Months, \$8.00
Three Months, \$5.00
Daily only, 35c.
Sunday only, 10c.
For all points west of the Mississippi River add \$1.00 per year for daily or daily and Sunday editions.

FOREIGN RATES:
Daily and Sunday, \$25.00
Daily only, \$15.00
Sunday only, \$5.00

Entered at the Postoffice at New York as Second Class Mail Matter.

GUARANTEE:
You can purchase merchandise advertised in THE TRIBUNE with absolute safety—for if dissatisfied, then return in any case THE TRIBUNE guarantees to pay your money back upon request. No red tape. No questions. We make good promptly if the advertiser does not.

MEMBER OF THE ASSOCIATED PRESS
The Associated Press is exclusively entitled to the use for publication of all news dispatches credited to it or not otherwise credited in this paper, and also the local news of spontaneous origin published here.

All rights of republication of all other matter herein also are reserved.

"Peccavi"

As it is ungracious to examine the teeth of a gift horse, so it is perhaps impolite to study the words of an apology.

But Dr. Butler might have gone further, after a full week's reflection, than to express regret, in form at least, only to those who "felt" hurt by what he had said. A man retracts not merely to compose the emotions of those he has unjustly assailed but to cleanse himself. An apology was owing to himself though no one felt hurt.

Nor is Dr. Butler happy in the language he employs to explain how it happened that words "both unbecoming and unwarranted" came from his lips. He says, seemingly in the way of half-justification, that he was under the strain of a "sharp revolt against the power of money in politics." This is a flavor of smugness. While presenting himself as one who had slandered others he in the same sentence advertises his exceptional purity and sensitiveness to evil.

But the apology does not reach the heart of Dr. Butler's offense. In effect he charged that General Wood relied, presumptively in an illegitimate manner, on money. By implication there is a repetition of this outrageous misstatement. There is no frank and manly admission that the expenditures were a necessary consequence of the primary campaign the Wood managers conducted. He does not say that the issue the General forced was whether he should go to the people or to the politicians and that General Wood chose the cleaner and more open method.

Another "Plot"

Once more the Germans are injured innocents. An International Seamen's Conference is in session at Geneva, and the admission of the German delegates is opposed by the British delegates. One objection was that they had been sent by the German government and were not truly representative of German seamen. Another objection was the recent habit of German seamen to murder other sailors and helpless civilians. The Germans reply that exclusion is the result of a "plot" by the British delegates.

It is a further curious illustration of the workings of the German mind that the attitude of seamen generally toward those who participated in the sea murders cannot be understood. One of the German delegates declares that his fellow seamen could no more have interfered with the U-boat campaign than the British Seamen's Union with the blockade of Germany. Perhaps, but the indignation which other seamen feel was bred in large part by the heartless brutalities which accompanied this campaign. Sinking the ships was bad enough, but the cruelty of leaving the survivors to perish in open boats was not incidental but deliberate.

No one who knows the traditions of the sea will fail to understand the feeling of honest seamen of every nation. The spirit of chivalry survives among them. To save life even at the risk of one's own is an obligation, no true seaman ignores. The conduct of the German seamen stained a calling which from time out of mind has held the claims of humanity sacred. While the war was still raging the German seamen were told frankly that they would not easily be readmitted to the fellowship of the sea. Some day they may understand why.

Bergdoll and Others

Having suppressed the conclusions reached by the military authorities in the malodorous case of Bergdoll, Secretary Baker is apparently content to let it drop. Bergdoll is still at large, and Federal agents are unfortunate in their efforts to catch him. But the District Attorney in Philadelphia is made of sterner stuff. He has got a special grand jury together for the purpose of uncovering the parties to the conspiracy. There have been few worse scandals than the escape of this loosely guarded prisoner, let out in consequence of a story of a pot of gold which could hardly have deceived a child.

Philadelphia supplies another illustration of the tenderness of the Administration toward German sympathizers in the pardon of the notorious editors of the "Tageblatt" before they had even begun to serve their sentence. These men sought to obstruct the conduct of the war by the publication of false news. The first prosecution failed through the ineptitude of a former district attorney. The second resulted in their conviction, and the sentence was affirmed by the United States Supreme Court. Yet they are now free.

The other day a mere youth who had overstayed his leave and had become technically a deserter was shot and killed by an army sergeant on the plea that when discovered he did not obey the order to halt promptly enough. The contrast between the penalty visited on him and the leniency extended to far worse offenders is too obvious to need emphasizing.

Chivalry in the Elwell Case

The ingenious idea that chivalry is the word which should govern a District Attorney's office in conducting the investigation of a murder problem probably accounts for Mr. Swann's efforts to keep the police safely in the background of the Elwell case.

Police are notoriously crude and coarse in their methods of investigation. Obviously one cannot rely upon them to do the right thing, the polite thing, in so delicate an affair of honor as the identity of the ladies that knew Mr. Elwell best. There have been certain identifications made. The young woman from Kentucky was so adequately described by the investigation of our local authorities as to make it necessary for her to bare to the public the facts of her casual acquaintance with Elwell. Yesterday the mysterious "woman in black" was also officially identified. But the code of chivalry cannot be expected to extend to women who know Elwell only slightly or not at all. The identity of "Miss Wilson" remains a carefully protected secret, and chivalry still rules triumphant.

Of course, if an arrest should be made and ultimately a defendant should be placed on trial, the identity of this young woman would be revealed, for she presumably would be called as a witness. But, judging by the present progress of the case, she need not worry about that for some time.

The Ultimatum

Secretary Colby was the last departing delegate to San Francisco to have a personal conference with the President. He said just before leaving Washington: "I don't believe the document [the league treaty] requires any interpretative reservations."

Since Senators Pittman and Hitchcock offered interpretative reservations with the permission of the President, it is a little awkward to dismiss their efforts as superfluous or hostile. Even the Virginia platform, so highly eulogized by the President, condemns only nullifying reservations. Mr. Colby is somewhat tolerant of the mental flabbiness of Democratic statesmen who cry out for saving paraphrases. But his heart isn't in that sort of defensive coloration. He says frankly: "The document, in other words, is so clear that interpretative reservations can hardly be urged as necessary."

That is the unchanging truth as the President sees it. He believes that the covenant he brought back from Paris is letter perfect. In the view of our ranking peace commissioner it is gilding refined gold to try to improve its phraseology. Sometimes with angry expostulation, he has argued with the covenant's would-be clarifiers that they are engaged in a vain and unworthy enterprise. In his final injunction to the national convention there is no shadow of turning.

The President served an ultimatum on the Senate: "Take my treaty draft as it stands or nothing." Why shouldn't he repeat that ultimatum to his followers at San Francisco? Then he can say to the voters as he has always wished to do: "Indorse me and my work or stand forever dishonored at the bar of history."

The Aristocratic Bicycle

Why do dynasties rise and fall and return once more? Why does art proceed from romance to realism and back again? Why does a wheel go around? We are not sure that we can answer these ingenious questions, but we are certain of the important fact that the bicycle, for almost a generation unmounted and unsung, is actually reappearing, with honor and ceremony, almost enthusiasm.

There may be a deep and philosophic content in the fact. The occultists will doubtless find a mystical explanation for the descent from four wheels to two. As for the economic explanation, we dismiss it as a contributing factor—as derogatory to one of the most delightful and ingenious machines ever contrived by the mind of man. We prefer the simpler view, that as Ulysses finally came home from his wanderings, so bicyclists, having ignored their best love through many years, are now turning back to faithful Penelope, her of the sparkling spokes and whirling pedals.

If any explanation other than that of the heart and its cycles (we use

the word in its metaphysical sense) is necessary, there is the ennobling one that since everybody purchased an automobile nobody could be anybody without some other and distinguishing method of progress. How could a professor, for example, maintain aloofness and dignity, save by procuring a bicycle and pedaling to class? He could, of course, drive a Ford, that useful vehicle of the very rich and the very poor, that no man with a union card would be found dead in. But a Ford takes gasoline—not much, but some—and with professional and other bourgeois incomes at their present low ebb the economic reason has probably aided the factor of sound snobbery to bring the bicycle back to popularity.

The bicycle, in short, is returning for just the reasons that are driving the silk shirt out. Save to lay bricks in or wheel a barrow through, that garment of display and splendor has utterly vanished. The most silent, solitary and elegant of all vehicles is returning to its own, after years of desertion, by the route of economic pressure, but chiefly and primarily because of its true and lasting distinction, which no number of snorting cylinders, whether by earth or sky, can permanently eclipse.

The Long Skirt

For the Attorney General of the United States to link himself with Paris fashion experts as opposed to the domestic fashion leaders in a contest for world supremacy in styles shows how unconquered is his appetite for trouble. His plea for the short skirt, which is favored by the Rue de la Paix, has brought down on his head the wrath of New York designers, who propose to dispute French leadership.

That this season is selected for a change is rather unfortunate. It will require the replacement of good garments with new ones. The point made by the dressmakers that longer skirts will not cost any more than shorter ones is no doubt true, for the amount of material used has never made much difference in the price of clothes. Indeed, if anything, the smaller the piece of apparel the costlier.

Aside from the economic viewpoint, much is to be said for American designers, and the contest should be a merry one. Many strange things come out of Paris, and the most flexible imagination hesitates at pronouncing them beautiful or fascinating. Time was when it was hinted that they were designed only for American trade, a Paris label being depended upon to put over the most atrocious whimsy. But American taste grows more discriminating. If American designers will avoid freakish pitfalls the race with Paris may not be lost, despite the Attorney General.

Major and Minor Wars

There is political disturbance in Asiatic Turkey, which threatens to extend to other Levantine regions. Contemporaneously Germany indicates she intends, in contempt of the peace terms, to build up a new army. The difference in the American attitude toward the two crises concretely illustrates a thought of those who have insisted on reservations to the covenant.

Not one American in one hundred, it is safe to say, favors American intervention in Turkey. This was plainly revealed in the declaration of the Armenian mandate. On the other hand, a preponderant American opinion, we believe, favors action to prevent Germany rebeginning the war.

We don't know much about Turkey. Her wars do not immediately concern us. Whatever the partition there, our peace and the safety of civilization in general are not seriously menaced. Many of us personally have notions with respect to what would constitute a just settlement, but the controversy is complicated and far away.

Otherwise it is with respect to Germany. If Germany is allowed to weapon herself once more there is little doubt of what will happen or what Germany will scheme to have happen. Another expedition beyond the Rhine would become Germany's prime objective. Such a march means danger to us and would involve us in another world struggle.

Common sense requires discrimination when considering the problems of Germany and Turkey. One problem directly affects us and the other does not. It is reasonable to adopt as to one a policy of participation and as to the other a policy of aloofness.

Now, the covenant, as President Wilson tried to jam it through, made no distinction between a Germany and a Turkey. All wars were alike. He assumed that there was no such thing as geography or proportion or relativity, and that if it were wise for this country to join in policing Germany it was wise to join in policing Turkey or Tibet or other remote places of the world. He tried to make one rule apply, whereas diversity demanded variation. He would not see Germany was in need of special treatment, and that it is far more necessary to supervise her than areas where power is scattered and the selfishness of one tribal nation neutralizes that of another.

The blunder was fundamental. The way to peace at Paris was to

confirm the war-born alliance and to maintain it firm and strong until such time as Germany, the chief power of the counter alliance, had recovered sanity and could be trusted. The President fought this. He insisted on his false premise that all nations were alike and were to be treated in the same fashion. The conception was artificial and ignored both historical facts and existing conditions.

Reservations thus become indispensable to correct the assumption of universality. What the American people desired was to join a league to protect world peace, but they did not regard themselves as competent to pass on and interfere in every local quarrel.

The line of difference is, of course, not easily drawn. A minor disturbance may grow into a major one. Yet the line could have been drawn. The President did not try to trace it. He jumbled the big and the little, the important and the unimportant. He would not allow us to join in any alliance unless we were willing to join a scheme which would commit us to sending troops wherever there was a local riot.

Rally to Harding

Issues That Remain, Though Wood Is Defeated

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: There seems to be little doubt that the will of the great majority of Republicans was overridden by the convention. General Wood was their choice. He was recognized as the most capable man for the office and, moreover, he had beyond question saved our country from defeat in the great war, in spite of the egregious folly of the present Administration.

We have been deprived of the pleasure and the satisfaction of voting for the man of our choice, but there is now no time to think of it. We can remember later the men who maneuvered this result. Our present duty is to rally to the support of Senator Harding. The better we know him the more we shall like him, and the fact stands out large that he is better than the best man who has been suggested or that can be named by the San Francisco convention.

It is refreshing to recall that in a few months we may vote denunciation of the pacifist bunch which, with the approval, if not under the direct orders, of the President, failed to prepare for the inevitable conflict, failed to train the men, failed to manufacture the arms—failed in everything. Now is the time to remember our troops training with wooden guns under a Secretary of War who thought it time enough for them to obtain real guns in France. The men who needed long training in such lengthy subjects as the art of navigation were feverishly studying it for the first time more than a year after we were kicked into the war by a contemptuous Germany.

Roosevelt, in one of his last articles, summed the matter up as follows: "During the war the Administration, often incompetent to the verge of impudence in dealing with war problems and with the Hun within our gates, showed itself a past master in bullying, browbeating, deceiving and puzzling our own people."

There is now opportunity for the people to rebuke the presumption of the President in his whole course respecting the treaty. Roosevelt points out in the same article that, following immediately upon the repudiation of Wilson and his policies at the polls in 1918 by the election of a hostile majority in the Senate, he, who in any other country would have been retired to private life, undertook to speak alone for the whole American people, and to that end seized, through his Postmaster General, the cables, obviously to control the news and to permit both our people and the Allies and our enemies to hear only what he might desire to have reported.

If the League of Nations has any life left, so far as our nation is concerned, it is because the germ of the idea had been in existence before Wilson was elected and has survived in spite of the treatment it has received at his hands.

However, it is not Wilson we now attack. His power for mischief is about ended. Those who richly deserve to be called to account are the leaders of the Democratic party, without whose aid and countenance the unbroken line of blunders and failures could not have been committed and his consistent wilfulness could not have brought our country to the very verge of defeat and ruin. It is sickening to recall that, had these Democrats not given aid, this amateur omniscient could not have run his course unchecked, and that had we gone into the war when honor and interest alike demanded it, Russia would not have been plunged into the gulf and we would have been saved at least half the cost of the war both in money and in the lives of our soldiers.

Let every independent voter and every Democrat (and there are thousands of them) who would have voted for Wood turn to and roll up a magnificent majority for Harding.

CHARLES E. MANIERRE.
New York, June 16, 1920.

The Salvation Army Drive

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: On the day that the Salvation Army had expected to finish their drive and write down the completed sum of \$1,000,000 they find themselves with \$200,000.

A man came in to see me yesterday, a single man, whose income is about \$5,000 a year. We spoke of the Salvation Army, of their wonderful work, and how much we admired them. I asked him to tell me how much he had given to this Home Fund Drive and he said he had given \$25.00. I asked him to tell me how much he had given to this Home Fund Drive and he said he had given \$25.00. I asked him to tell me how much he had given to this Home Fund Drive and he said he had given \$25.00.

SAUEL S. KEYSER.
New York, June 20, 1920.

The Conning Tower

Independent
Gideon Hoskins once laid out the frame
For a new barn, and mortised it. One day
Tobias Chase came by and said to Gid,
"Well, Gid, ye'll hev to change that frame o' yours."
"I guess not, Tobe," says Gid. "Oh, yes, ye will."
Tobias answers: "It ain't mortised right."
Ye'll hev to change it, jest ye mark my words."
"I guess not, Tobe," says Gid again.
With that,
He hammered all the harder . . . Raising came—
Then, sure enough, Tobias' words proved true.
Of course, Gid might have saved much toil and time
By taking Tobe's advice; but, as he said,
A Hoskins never gave in to a Chase.
G. S. B.

"As a great admirer and a constant reader"—if she had said "but" we'd have liked it better—"of your column," writes Sophie A. Wolf, "I take the liberty of calling you to task for the lukewarm manner in which you are supporting the Republican nominees. We all of us had our favorite candidates and were naturally disappointed at the Chicago decision; but as good Republican soldiers it behooves us to fall into line and to work with might and main for the success of the party. Please, therefore, take a firm stand and get up some enthusiasm; the feeling will come later." Well, we, for one, are not a good Republican soldier, so some days we don't feel even lukewarm about the nominees; there are days when, light-minded and frivolous, we don't feel about them at all. That's our stand; and it is as firm as any we have ever taken.

Among the things that cost less now than in 1914 there are, offers R. W. T. Red Seal Victor Records, the subway fare to Coney Island, the New York Evening Post. And letter postage, Miss Carolyn Wells discovers, is cheaper than it was two years ago.

"On another occasion aboard, the band played 'America,' which carries the same air as 'God Save the King.' Dr. Mannix, believing that the British anthem was being played, remained seated."—The World.

Even we have difficulty distinguishing them when we don't hear the words.

The Simple Solution of the Elwell Mystery

Sir: Why all this delay and pother about the Elwell mystery when the solution is the easiest thing in the world?

There is one man who knows who killed Elwell, and that is Elwell. Why not ask him?

Sir Oliver Lodge recently has toured the country giving proofs of the possibility of communicating with the dead. Thousands of books have been published in the last few years denouncing the skeptics and giving innumerable instances of indubitable messages.

Eminent scientists like Lodge, Crookes, Wallace, Barratt and other acute reasoners like Doyle and Maeterlinck have avowed that they took every precaution against fraud, and that these communications are undeniable.

There are hundreds of mediums in New York who will call anybody back or answer any question. Professor Hyslop has already talked to several of them. Lodge says a hole has undoubtedly been made in the wall between this world and the next.

And now the authorities cease wasting time and the public money in interviewing living and reluctant witnesses, and on searching cigarette stubs for fingerprints. There is one witness eager to testify who killed him, and that is Elwell.

If the mediums will not willingly do their duty they should be compelled by law to make the connection that is easily made. Surely no judge would hesitate to accept the dead witness's testimony, communicated, as it would be, by such noble and honest persons as the mediums in their trances. They could not decide if they would.

A tremendous power is right at hand for putting an end to these everlasting murder mysteries. It is wicked to waste that power on the pinning of stains on coats across, when it might be made an engine of justice that it would make it forever impossible to commit crime and escape discovery.

Mediums, page Mr. Elwell! Let every one of the millions of Latin boards get busy. Let all the automatic writers take their pencils in hand. Millions of dollars have been spent in occult activities. Here at last is our chance to get a few of them back.

RUPERT HUGHES.

Austin Dobson's poem in the London Mercury says, a. o. t.:

But where there are bells
There must also be ringers,
And where the heart swells
There will always be ringers.

The main trouble, to our notion, with unbridled verse is the ringers. There are too many ringers. There was a time when the mere fact that a thing rhymed didn't make it good; but there are many "poets" now who appear to believe that mere lack of rhyme is enough for excellence.

It may cheer unsuccessful contributors to know that their stuff has not been thrown into the zinc wastebasket recently. Somebody stole it the other day, so we throw all the stuff we don't use on the floor.

But a Good Clear Is a Smoke
(From The Evening Telegram)
723, 312 West (Riverdale Drive).—Room, shower, telephone, woman, \$10. Schwartz.

Truthfulness is a commoner trait than it is popularly believed to be; but we never have heard a bather admit that the water was too cold.

According to somebody who told somebody who told Mr. O. G. Villard, General Wood's entire reading for a year consisted of the Army and Navy Magazine. Maybe he would like to read Butler's "The Way of All Flesh."

"I have known and honored New York for many years as a frequent visitor," writes the Rev. John Roach Straton.

Oh, Doctor, the honor is New York's.
F. P. A.

YES, BUT LOTS OF TIMES THEY DON'T PAY ANY ATTENTION

Copyright, 1920, New York Tribune Inc.



Books

By
Frederic F. Van de Water

Though the West we are familiar with ends in the vicinity of Pittsburgh, it seems to us that "On a Passing Frontier," by Frank B. Linderman (Scribner), is the best thing of its sort since "The Virginian."

Perhaps that is not exactly a fair comparison, for Mr. Wister's book is a cohesive novel and Mr. Linderman's a rambling collection of sketches and tales. Yet there is a certain clarity in the atmosphere of each and a lack of gaudy local color that lead you to believe the author knows what he is talking about and is drawing on his memory rather than his imagination.

The stories that Mr. Linderman writes might have been related about a fire where old plainmen and riders of the frontier had gathered, and they are set down in much the way the old-timers might have told them.

There are no elaborate plots; sometimes there are no plots at all; but the West that was and the people who lived in the West are drawn with a pen as sharp and fine as an engraving tool.

One of the things for which we are most grateful to Mr. Linderman is his tale's simplicity in outline and in diction. No sooner does the average writer speak of "coules," "sombrero" or any one of a couple of dozen similar words dear to the heart of the title writer for William S. Hart films than he and his characters begin to run wild with the English language.

We don't know who is usually the worse offender, the English writer who draws an American character or the average Easterner depicting a Westerner, but we do know that Mr. Linderman writes as one who tells of his own people. Humor and pathos and abounding drama can be found in his all too short book.

What Would Roosevelt Now Do?

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: In your editorial of the 18th, under the caption "Harding and Roosevelt," you ask what would Colonel Roosevelt now do if he were in the flesh and called upon to choose between support of Senator Harding and support of Mr. Wilson.

Let me, as a firm believer in and follower of that great leader, briefly state what I think he would have done and would do.

At the Chicago convention he, with all that splendid energy and brain power he possessed, would have, in unmistakable English, told the convention that without question it was the will of the people that Leonard Wood should be the candidate of the Republican party and that the proposed action of the convention was with the full intent of putting the "Old Guard" of the Republican party back in the saddle.

If he were here he would have called on such a man as George W. Perkins, who has just gone over the "great divide" to join him, brought the Progressive party again into action, placed Leonard Wood at the head of the ticket and led the party to victory—not as in 1912, but complete.

Would that he were here! The "old guard" have taken advantage of his going. They have soon forgotten what happened in 1912. The lesson may have to be taught again. A. T. ROSE.
New York, June 19, 1920.

General Laziness

It Is Called the One Great Cause of High Prices

To the Editor of The Tribune.

"Sir: I have, as has every one, been greatly interested in the high cost of living and all its attendant evils and inconveniences. There is a continual trade and fault-finding with conditions and attempts to locate the blame. No one, in the writer's opinion, has tried to hit the nail squarely on the head. There is no use in dodging and calling for 'increased production' without stating the real cause of the lack of production. All the writers on the subject beat about the bush and don't get at it with a grub hoe and bring the real cause to the front, using plain, everyday language, that even an ignorant man can understand."

In an article in "The Century Magazine" Bernhard Dernburg, former Minister of Finance of the German government, states the case more nearly than any other writer of the day.

In his article, "How Can Germany Pay?" he states that the "new freedom" they have attained to the people means more to eat and less to work. In a nutshell, it is laziness. Laziness on the part of every one. Short hours of labor and unwillingness on the part of the worker to work when he works. It makes no difference what labor is paid, provided a laborer's time is squandered fully and "best effort" is absent.

The commencement of the present condition is to be found in the barriers "half holiday." Seeing this, the worker must have his shorter hours and Saturday vacation. This is not so objectionable if during the forty-four-hour week the best effort is put in. But it is not in very many vocations. To illustrate, let us select some vocations on which data can be obtained.

Thirty years ago a bricklayer throughout the building trade would lay 2,000 brick in ten hours. Now he lays 700 in eight hours. The basis for contracts for the plumbing of a certain class of houses was nine days of ten hours. Now the figures are based on eighteen days of eight hours, a difference of fifty-four hours and an increase of 60 per cent in time. A carpenter in remodeling a house used to put on 2,000 shingles; now he lays 1,000 in fewer than eight hours.

On account of the high wages and short hours and supposed better place to live, the youth of the rural districts flock to the great centers and the farmer cannot get help to raise his crops. A house in a small town that cost formerly \$2,500, rented for \$22 a month. Now build a counterpart of that house and it will cost \$4,000 and must rent for \$35 a month, and the rent of the \$2,500 place will come up.

It is said that a man continually working will do as much in eight hours as in ten hours. He may in some vocations, but just so many linear feet of lumber can pass through a planer in an hour. A sewing machine can take a certain number of stitches in an hour; a machine lathe can make just so many revolutions in an hour. On the ten-hour day to eight hours, the efficiency of the plant is reduced 20 per cent. At the same wage a cost of production has increased 20 per cent. It is not alone the average workman that is to blame. It is every body.

The writer sees but one remedy and it is most deplorable, viz., the hardest kind of hard times—times when soap, houses and free lodging houses will be formed all over the country.

If the people will stop "sloddering of the jobs," will bend their backs to labor and work when they do work, there will be a healthy condition engendered and we will be happy and prosperous.

JAMES H. BEEBEE.
Elmhurst, L. I., June 22, 1920.

A Mistaken Choice

(From The Pittsburgh Gazette-Times)

Los Angeles surely is puzzled to understand why any party should pick the little village of San Francisco as a place in which to hold a convention when a larger and better place is available.